



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,553	01/23/2002	In Chul Jeong	0465-0838P-SP	5490
2292	7590	12/01/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			STINSON, FRANKIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,553

Applicant(s)

JEONG ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 8-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 8 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. It is noted that applicant elected the species of fig. 1 **without** traverse in the response filed April 8, 2004. Nonetheless, applicant argues the examiner's withdrawal of claims 10-18, and specifically claims 12. Please note that in said election of April 8, 2004, fig. 1 was elected. This embodiment does not include fins on the circulation duct. The subject matter of claim 12 is directed to non-elected fig. 4., however, upon the allowance of a **generic** claim, the claims will be rejoined as is the Office practice.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 20, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either UK 2,215,826 or Dottor et al.

Re claim 1, note that there is disclosed a washing machine comprising: a first tub (1 in UK'826, 3 in Dottor), a second tub (2 in UK'826; 5 in Dottor) disposed in the first tub; at least one circulation duct (8 in UK'826; 20 in Dottor) operatively coupled with the first tub to receive air from the second tub, dehumidify the air and recirculate the dehumidified air back into the second tub to dry laundry in the second tub during a drying operation of the washing machine and a water supplying duct (12 in UK'826, 22 in Dottor; 323) for supplying external water to the inside of an inner wall of the at least

one circulation duct (see UK'826, page 4, lines 13-16 and Dottor col. 3, lines 25-33) to dehumidify the air. Re claim 3, UK'826, Japan'296, Dottor and Muller disclose the fan and heater. Re claim 4, the fan in UK'286, and Dottor is believed to be a "sirocco type" fan. Re claims 8 and 22, Dottor discloses the grooves in a helical configuration. Re claim 19, Japan'296 discloses the pulsator. Re claim 20 Dottor discloses the drain duct coupled to the first tub. Re claim 21, Dottor discloses the opening for the recirculation and drain duct being spaced as claimed.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim in view of Japan'296.

Claim 19 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the pulsator.

Japan'296 discloses the pulsator. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either UK'826 or Dottor to be of the pulsator type since they are considered to be the equivalent to one another see (MPEP

2144.06 SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either UK'826, Dottor et al. in view of UK 2,075,559.

Claim 9 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the external air supply supplied by a fan. UK'559 discloses the external supply as supplied by a fan (10) as

claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either UK'826 or Dottor, to include an external air supply as taught by UK'559, for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the condenser.

6. Applicant's arguments filed Oct. 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to the remarks on the restriction requirement, please note that this was actually an election of species and made in accordance with MPEP sections 809.02, 809.02(a), 809.02(c). As for the timing of the election see MPEP 811. The 806 sections of the MPEP refer to restriction requirement between independent inventions. A species is not considered to be an independent invention but a variation of one embodiment. As for the best art, please note that the examiner has applied the best references and removed no less than 50 references from consideration.. In regard to the invention as is now claimed, please note the references as applied in paragraph 3 above where the references clearly discloses that water is in contact with the wall of the recirculation duct.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:30 and some Saturdays from approximately 7:30 am to 1:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls


FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746